



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that Cumberland seized upon certain external characteristics of Schiller's play, which appealed to him because of their dramatic effectiveness, and upon these as a framework constructed a romantic drama which preserves little of the vigor and strength of the original.

Don Pedro, called El Diablo, the son of a Spanish nobleman, has been discarded by his family on account of his liberal principles and savage character. He joins a band of robbers, and by his superior vices is raised to the dignity of being their leader. Henrique, his brother, is the very antithesis of Don Pedro and the embodiment of all that is good and amiable. He falls by chance into the hands of the robbers, is stabbed, and left for dead by his brother. Pedro now disguises himself in Henrique's clothes and gains admission to the house of his uncle, who, believing him to be Henrique, is about to bestow upon him the hand of his daughter Celestina; but Celestina has a dream in which she is apprised of the villainy of Pedro and his supposed murder of Henrique. But the father will not be convinced by any such flimsy evidence. An inquiry concerning the supposed murder of Henrique is instigated by the inquisitor. Nicholas, a messenger to whom Henrique had given a letter recommending that his brother should take flight before his infamy should be revealed, is condemned. The evidence is supplied by Pedro, who represents that he, as Henrique, had written the letter and that Nicholas had robbed him. But the real Henrique has followed after his messenger, and relates to the inquisitor the true state of affairs. Nicholas is set free, Henrique is joined to Celestina and Don Pedro, crowded to the wall, commits suicide.

Cumberland is indebted to Schiller not so much for the details of the plot, as for the idea of the banditti, the hostility between the two brothers and, above all, for the general characteristics of Don Pedro, bearer of the title rôle. In his person the author combined the worst characteristics of both Karl and Franz Moor, resulting in an enormity so unnatural and grotesque that the human element is scarcely recognizable. He is, like Karl Moor, a free, unrestrained spirit, has Karl's disregard for established custom and social order and finally falls a prey of his own pernicious appetites and desires. There is, however, in his

character, no suggestion of the human and pathetic side of Karl's nature, his intense love for Emilia and his father, his ultimate regret for the waywardness of his life and his fatalistic conviction that he was the victim of inevitable circumstances. For these redeeming qualities are substituted Franz's cunning and cruelty, unscrupulousness, and atheism. The fusion of the two brothers Karl and Franz into one character made it necessary to create a new figure, Henrique, who is the virtuous and injured lover of the conventional type. Schiller's style is reflected in Cumberland's diction by the employment of extravagant language calculated to express violent emotion. It is, however, a feeble echo of his model and has the effect of bombast and inflation. We are conscious that behind the words there is no convincing personality, and behind the personality no burning experience in the author's life.

Don Pedro was produced for the first time at the Haymarket Theatre July 26, 1796, and met with little success. It was announced for a second representation with a "mixture of applause and approval." After four performances it was taken off and never revived. That Cumberland himself was not very well satisfied with his effort may be inferred from the fact that he scarcely mentions it in his *Memoirs*.

GEORGE M. BAKER.

Philadelphia.

THE DATE OF CHAUCER'S MARRIAGE GROUP

It is a matter of considerable interest to determine at what period of Chaucer's development the "Marriage Group" of *Canterbury Tales* (which, according to Professor Kittredge's definition, consists of Groups D, E, and F, containing the *Wife of Bath's Prolog and Tale*, the *Friar's Tale*, *Summoner's Tale*, *Clerk's Tale*, *Merchant's Tale*, *Squire's Tale*, and *Franklin's Tale*, with the intervening links, etc.), was composed. Fortunately we have some reliable chronological data. In his *Envoy to Bukton* Chaucer says to his friend:

The Wyf of Bathe I pray you that ye rede
Of this matere that we have on honde,

the "matere" being Bukton's approaching marriage. Now since this poem was written in the latter part of 1396, as shown by Skeat (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 85), the allusion gives us a *terminus ad quem* for the completion of the Wife's prolog, (see also Tatlock, *Development and Chronology*, pp. 210, 211). Moreover, the remarkable parallels of thought and phraseology between the *Wife of Bath's Prolog* and the *Merchant's Tale* have very properly been taken as evidence that these two works were written within a rather short interval of time (Tatlock, pp. 201, 202). Other chronological data have been obtained from our knowledge of what books Chaucer was reading at the time he was working on the Marriage Group. It is a well known fact that the *Wife of Bath's Prolog* is very deeply indebted to St. Jerome's work *adversus Jovinianum* (see *Essays on Chaucer*, Chaucer Soc., pp. 298 ff.). When we inquire what other works of Chaucer show the influence of this work of St. Jerome's, we find that in the *Merchant's Tale* (E 1294 ff.) Theophrastus, who is embodied in St. Jerome's treatise, is quoted by name, that the Summoner (D 1929) alludes to Jovinian, and that Dorigen's lament in the *Franklin's Tale* (F 1355-1456) is made up from St. Jerome, Book I, chapters 41-46. This common use of the same material gives us ground for the inference that these three works were composed at no great interval after the *Wife of Bath's Prolog*. But Chaucer's use of St. Jerome furnishes us with another clew. In the *A* prolog to the *Legend of Good Women*, ll. 281 ff., the God of Love cites Jerome against Jovinian, and sums up the chapters, mentioned above, which furnish the material for Dorigen's lament in the *Franklin's Tale*.¹ Now, if I may be allowed to beg the question of the priority of the two prologs to the *Legend of Good Women*, there is very good ground for assigning to the *A* prolog a date not long after June 7, 1394.² If we accept this date for the *A* prolog we have good evidence, so far as it goes, for dating the Marriage Group near 1394 or 1395.

Within a few months, however, Mr. Lowes has

furnished us with some additional evidence. He has shown³ that the *Merchant's Tale*, the *Wife of Bath's Prolog*, and, probably, the *Franklin's Tale* are indebted to Dechamps' *Miroir de Mariage*, and that the *A* prolog to the *Legend of Good Women* shows the influence of the same work. This, of course, lends additional force to the inference that the Marriage Group was, roughly speaking, contemporary with the *A* prolog. Finally, Mr. Lowes points out that Chaucer had about this time an excellent opportunity for securing a copy of the *Miroir*, thru the agency of Sir Lewis Clifford, who renewed his acquaintance with Dechamps during the peace negotiations carried on at Lolinghem early in 1393. In summing up his conclusions as to the chronological bearings of this new evidence Mr. Lowes emphasises "the clearer light which is thrown, by Chaucer's use of the *Miroir*, upon the close and intimate interrelations of the Marriage Group as a whole. For whatever the order within the group, the common relation of its members to the *Miroir de Mariage* affords conclusive evidence of what has long been regarded as probable on other grounds—the fact, namely, that the various tales which deal specifically with marriage belong to the same general period. And that period, there is good reason to believe, began in 1393."⁴

I wish now to call attention to a point that has never, I believe, been utilised in discussing the chronology of the *Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer's *Envoy to Scogan* was very probably written in the autumn of 1393 (*Oxford Chaucer*, I, 556, 557). In this poem Chaucer, after putting into Scogan's mouth the words :

Lo ! olde Grisel list to ryme and pleye !

replies as follows :

Nay, Scogan, sey not so, for I mexcuse,
God help me so ! in no rym, doutelees,
Ne thinke I never of slepe wak my muse,
That rusteth in my shethe stille in pees.
Whyl I was yong, I putte hir forth in prees,
But al shal passe that men prose or ryme ;
Tak every man his turn, as for his tyme.

One might be inclined to deny to this utterance of Chaucer's, occurring as it does in verse of so

¹ For this material in regard to Chaucer's use of St. Jerome, see Skeat, index and notes to *Oxford Chaucer*, and Koeppl, *Anglia*, XIII, 174 ff., *Archiv*, LXXXIV, 414, 415.

² Lowes, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xx, 780-801, Tatlock, p. 122.

³ *Modern Philology*, VIII, 165-186, 305-334.

⁴ *Modern Philology*, VIII, 332, 333.

light a vein, all significance whatever. Yet, when we consider the matter more closely, it is difficult to show any solid ground for discrediting Chaucer's statement, that his muse was "rusting in his sheath" at the time he rallied Scogan on his blasphemies against Love. All that we can say against it is that it is obviously expressed with humorous exaggeration, but it may nevertheless be based upon sober fact. For there is, *a priori*, nothing improbable in Chaucer's statement. In the last decade of his life, Chaucer was occupied only with the *Canterbury Tales* and occasional short poems. Now, from all that we know of his methods of work we may be sure that Chaucer did not write the *Canterbury Tales* as Trollope is said to have written his novels, at the regular rate of so many pages a day. The work took shape in his mind little by little, and, as Miss Hammond has very suggestively said,⁵ each set of pilgrims, with their corresponding tales, was the result of a separate impulse to the poet's imagination. Among these various *motifs* that Chaucer made use of for carrying on his work were, to follow Miss Hammond again,⁶ the romantic-religious group represented by the Knight, Prioress, etc.; the "quarrel group" of Miller and Reeve, etc.; and the Marriage Group. When his imagination was kindled by the dramatic possibilities of some new device, Chaucer worked at the *Canterbury Tales* with great energy; when he had exhausted these possibilities he laid the work aside until he could come at another device. It seems reasonable, therefore, to take Chaucer's utterance in the *Envoy to Scogan* as marking one of these periods in which he was not actively at work on the *Canterbury Tales*, but lying fallow.

If this view be accepted, the allusion has an obvious bearing upon the date of the Marriage Group. It corroborates in a striking way Mr. Lowes's theory that the composition of this section of the *Canterbury Tales* began at the end of 1393 or very early in 1394. For, in consideration of the evidence we already have that Chaucer was enthusiastically at work on the Marriage Group in 1394 or 1395, a period of inactivity in the autumn of 1393 must surely indicate that when Chaucer wrote his *Envoy to Scogan* he had

not yet received this important inspiration. We may therefore with increased confidence assign to the Marriage Group the date 1393-1396.

SAMUEL MOORE.

Harvard University.

ZU EINIGEN STELLEN IN GOETHE'S EGMONT

Zweiter Aufzug, Egmont's Wohnung. "Noch hab' ich meines Wachstums Gipfel nicht erreicht; und steh' ich droben einst, so will ich fest, nicht ängstlich stehn. Soll ich fallen, so mag ein Donnerschlag, ein Sturmwind, *ja ein selbst verfehelter Schritt* mich abwärts in die Tiefe stürzen; da lieg ich" u. s. w.

Beim ersten Augenschein wird man gewiss die gesperrt gedruckten Worte im Sinne "durch eignes Verschulden verfehlt" auffassen, wie es ja die Übersetzer und Commentatoren, soweit sie die Stelle berücksichtigen, auch durchweg tun. Bei näherem Zusehn zeigt es sich aber, dass der Nachdruck auf 'Schritt' liegen kann, mit Nebenton auf 'selbst'; wodurch 'selbst' nicht mehr 'verfehlt' modifizierte, sondern den ganzen Satzteil—ganz als wenn es hiesse, "ja selbst ein verfehelter Schritt." Das ist nun allerdings eine gewaltsame, um nicht zu sagen unmögliche Wortstellung, und es wäre sicherlich aussichtslos, nach Parallelen einer solchen Sprachwillkür suchen zu wollen. Andererseits ist ein Schritt, den man selbst (und kein anderer) verfehlt, als böse Tautologie noch anstössiger—was bisher übersehen worden ist.

Man bedenke, dass, allem Anschein nach, die ersten drei Akte des Dramas schon 1775 vorlagen, also zum Urtexte gehören, mit dem Goethe nach seinem Briefe an Frau von Stein vom 20. März 1782 so unzufrieden war. Dennoch will er "*nir*"¹ das allzuaufgeknöpfte, studentenhafte der Manier zu tilgen suchen, das der Würde des Gegenstands widerspricht." Möglicherweise entging dabei der etwas kraftgenialische Satz in diesem sonst durchaus würdigen Passus seiner Aufmerk-

⁵ Chaucer, p. 256.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 256 ff.

¹ Von mir, jedoch im Sinne der Stelle hervorgehoben.